

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN

An analysis of current international events



1918-1950

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION • INCORPORATED • 22 EAST 38TH STREET • NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

VOL. XXIX No. 30

MAY 5, 1950

Would 'New United Front' Lead to New Isolationism?

Former President Herbert Hoover, in his New York address before the American Newspaper Publishers Association on April 27, has performed a service both for the American people and for the rest of the world by focusing attention on a crucial issue. This issue is whether current United States aid to the Marshall Plan countries and projected aid to underdeveloped areas under Point Four is to be given or offered solely because of this country's opposition to Russia and communism on the explicit understanding that recipients of American assistance must unswervingly follow policies set by Washington. This happens to be the Communist propaganda thesis. Both official statements and public opinion here, however, assume that the United States has undertaken to aid Europe not solely because of fear of Russia and communism, but because of a genuine desire to help the restoration of that continent's economy, shattered by two world wars and weakened by the great depression of the 1930's; and that Point Four was designed to improve conditions in underdeveloped areas.

In the cold war, Mr. Hoover said, "We conduct the battle, with subsidies to beguile peoples to rectitude from internal communism. A year ago we made the Atlantic Military Pact. The expressed hope was that although there was no commitment to go to war, these nations would build up their own arms to adequately defend their own rooms. In persistence to an old habit, we are taking up the check. In the meantime we learn that our first defense—the atomic bomb—has been stolen from us. . . . More and more the

burdens of defending free men and nations are being thrust upon the American people, who are only one-sixth the population of the globe. We are becoming more and more isolated as the sole contender in this cold war. We are steadily losing ground because the non-Communist states are being picked off one by one or are compromising with the Communists."

In this analysis there is no reference to the great human and material losses suffered by the countries of Western Europe in World War II. These losses have not only impeded their post-war economic recovery, thereby threatening their internal stability, but have also made many Europeans, not unnaturally, less eager for another war than is true of some of us who, through good fortune, have not experienced fighting on this continent. Mr. Hoover's interpretation of the North Atlantic pact, which, however open it may be to criticism on other scores, was genuinely intended to be an act of collective security, is apparently that each of the signatories would be expected to defend itself alone, in its own "room"—not as a member of a working partnership with the United States.

What Kind of United Front?

Mr. Hoover's remedy for this situation is that "the United Nations should be reorganized without the Communist nations in it. If that is impractical, then a definite New United Front should be organized of those peoples who disavow communism, who stand for morals and religion, and who love freedom."

As several commentators have already

pointed out, Mr. Hoover's first remedy may be rendered obsolete by the continued nonpresence in the United Nations of the U.S.S.R. and Communist China, together accounting for 600 million of the world's population—although there is no indication at present that the Soviet government desires to leave the UN. His proposed exclusion of all Communist countries, however, would necessitate the banning of Yugoslavia, which has assumed a pivotal position in the strategic calculations of the United States. There Marshal Tito, in a statement issued on the eve of May Day, summoned all leftist groups disillusioned by Moscow to rally around Belgrade in a new Marxist front. Thus, if Mr. Hoover's second proposal, which has received less notice in public discussion than the first, were adopted by the United States, then presumably Washington would assume the leadership not merely of a front of "God-fearing free nations," as urged by Mr. Hoover, but of a front of anti-leftist, as well as anti-Russian, nations.

This is the really critical decision that confronts the United States, for now we shall all be forced to look searchingly at the international community to see who will stand up with us when such a new front is called. Britain unquestionably believes in freedom, but not in the economic frame of reference favored by Mr. Hoover. The other countries of Western Europe have turned more and more to various forms of socialism, not because they are "hanted" by John Maynard Keynes, as Mr. Hoover indicated, but because war-induced poverty has created dislocations so severe that the resources of the entire

Contents of this BULLETIN may be reproduced with credit to the Foreign Policy Association

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state must be mobilized and utilized if recovery is to be achieved.

Where Does U.S. Stand?

It is, of course, entirely possible that, if the United States, Britain and France, at present deeply divided over the future of Western Europe, fail at their London conference beginning May 8 to arrive at far-reaching and constructive decisions, civil strife will start in real earnest. This strife, however, may not be between democracy and communism, but between communism and nascent fascism. American arms may then well serve European governments to suppress unrest—but they may also serve to put in power governments intent on restoring the pre-1939 *status quo*. The United States might then find that the New United Front will be composed of Dr. Konrad Adenauer, increasingly discredited even among his followers, General Charles de Gaulle, whose star is again in the ascendant, and such neo-Fascist leaders as may snatch power from Italian Premier Alcide de Gasperi unless he succeeds in carrying out the economic and social reforms now opposed by a powerful group of his conservative and clerical supporters—and Franco.

Mr. Hoover has posed the issue not only

of the survival of the United Nations. He has also raised the question of what the United States stands for in a world in ferment. If the American people are ready to accept and respect the vast social and economic changes now sweeping the world, we can find loyal supporters in all lands, whatever their politics. If, however, the United States sponsors reaction, then no matter how much money we spend or arms we forge, we shall find ourselves alone except for a few individuals and groups whose support will embarrass more than it will cheer us. We may then discover, when it is too late, that our greatest safety lay in working with all nations, irrespective of their political, economic and social systems, within the framework of the United Nations, rather than in gambling on the never reliable assistance of paid mercenaries.

Mr. Hoover discounted in advance any queries that might be raised about his proposals by stating: "All this may give pain to some people. But by their cries ye shall know them." It is significant that the first extensive criticism of his views was made on April 28 by General Carlos P. Romulo, President of the 1949 United Nations General Assembly. General Romulo represents a people that has every

reason to be attached to the United States. He has proved himself a friend of this country. He is not a Communist. He has warned us that the world today stands in need of "unity, not uniformity." Actually there is a proposal for a new united front, minus Russia, now before the United States—French Premier Georges Bidault's suggestion for an "Atlantic High Council." Such a council, however, presupposes delegation of sovereignty not only by the Western European nations but also by the United States. Would such a council answer Mr. Hoover's specifications—or would he want the United States to maintain its sovereignty unimpaired?

It is not surprising that the American people, who like quick and final solutions to all problems, are growing weary and disheartened when they realize, for the first time, the great complexity of international affairs. There is a strong undertow today for return to isolationism—an undertow greatly strengthened by the desire for economy. Yet, if we should seek to have other nations accept, without qualifications, our way of doing things, we may find ourselves involuntarily confined to the "splendid isolation" which the British found it impossible to achieve.

VERA MICHELES DEAN

U.S. Faces Up to Long-Term Task in Germany

As the London meeting of the United States, British and French Foreign Ministers on May 8 approaches, American uneasiness over the course of events in Germany is mounting. Incessant press reports of rising German "nationalism" and disquieting signs of a growing *entente* between Communist and neo-Nazi militarist elements have contributed to this uneasiness. The bipartisan Senate resolution offered by Senator Guy M. Gillette, Democrat of Iowa, proposing that a Presidential commission take a "new look" at the German situation, has made headlines.*

New Concern Healthy

Congressional and public concern with the progress of the occupation is a healthy development. After V-E Day, Americans

gaped at the ruins of German cities, peered curiously at Goering, Hess and other arch-Nazis who survived the war, shuddered at pictures of Dachau and Buchenwald and then lapsed into a profound apathy about Germany, which has been dispelled only sporadically and then by challenging spectacles such as the airlift or tabloid thrillers like the Ilse Koch case. Whether exhausted or sated by military success, American energy and purpose never "followed through" in pursuit of the ends to which victory over the Wehrmacht was but the first step.

At present, however, the press and public exhibit great uncertainty in their approach to the "German problem." So far, support for and opposition to the Gillette resolution are equally quiescent. Preoccupation with the cold war and fear of "sticking one's neck out" in the lethal smog which has settled over Washington are not conducive to reasoned consideration of the nation's responsibilities in Germany. As in the case of China, there is a strong tendency to look for scapegoats, and often the blame is loaded on

to supposedly immutable Teutonic characteristics, such as "Prussian militarism."

Especially alarming to many Americans are the numerous reports that former Nazis have "filtered back" into high positions in industry, teaching, the civil service and even the higher levels of the Bonn government. These reports are the basis both for the charge that Germany is being "renazified" and the demand for a new purge through the exercise of Allied authority backed by force.

Understandable as is this reaction, it is based on an over-simplified diagnosis of the disease, which is at once more pervasive and less easily treated than might be supposed. Few SS generals have worked their way back into responsible positions. The spectacle, rather, is that of a multitude of persons whose Nazi party hue spanned many gradations of gray and who "joined up" to protect their prerogatives and profits. Opportunism and lack of courage are perennial and ubiquitous weaknesses which cannot be eradicated by summary process. In any event, German self-government has by now de-

*This resolution, S. Res. 260, was submitted on April 17 by Senator Gillette on behalf of himself and Senators Irving M. Ives, Republican of New York, Herbert H. Lehman, Democrat of New York, Paul H. Douglas, Democrat of Illinois, Claude Pepper, Democrat of Florida, Harley M. Kilgore, Democrat of West Virginia, Robert C. Hendrickson, Republican of New Jersey and Dennis Chavez, Democrat of New Mexico.

veloped so far that it would be out of the question for the Allies to turn back the clock and embark on a program of forceful weeding.

U.S. and HICOG Bewildered

Unhappily, if Joe Doakes is bewildered, the State Department and the High Commission in Germany are also far from sure of themselves. A number of important issues, most notably the question of the future ownership and control of the Ruhr industries and the I. G. Farben chemicals trust, remain in disquieting suspense. One senses that John J. McCloy, High Commissioner for Germany, has not yet been notably successful in establishing fruitful contacts with German leaders other than Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. In consequence, not only are we overly dependent on the political *status quo* in Germany, but the shrewd Cologne politician is ready and able to capitalize on this weakness in our position—for example, by demanding the establishment of a German Foreign Office as the price for joining the Council of Europe.

On the credit side must be listed Mr. McCloy's obvious awareness, manifested

in his February Stuttgart speech and his more recent appearances in Washington before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, that in the long run the success or failure of the occupation will be gauged by the growth of stable political and social democracy in Germany. It remains to be seen whether action will follow words. The projected High Commission budget for re-education and connected activities in Germany is somewhat larger than hitherto, but it is still far from sufficient in relation to the magnitude and difficulty of the undertaking.

In this connection the recently announced appointment of Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College in New York, as Commissioner for Bavaria presages, at the very least, a conciliatory approach to the Bavarian archconservative educational authorities who have stubbornly opposed American efforts to liberalize the semifudal Bavarian school system. These efforts have been publicly condemned by Dr. Shuster as "clumsy and even abysmally ignorant." So, too, all German authoritarian and Communist groups are likely to flaunt Dr. Shuster's denunci-

ation of American behavior in Germany. Just a year ago, speaking before the Academy of Political Science, he declared that "crimes committed by American personnel representing the United States seem so horrible in retrospect that it is difficult to believe that Americans could have resorted to such bestial practices."

The most encouraging development, however, is the recent disclosure in Frankfurt on April 22 that our occupation forces are making plans for at least another five years. This suggests that the confused or over-optimistic thinking which underlies most proposals for the rearmament of Germany, based on the hope of using German soldiers either to implement the North Atlantic pact or to "balance off" the East German police force established by the Russians, is unlikely to prevail, at least for the time being. This announcement may bring shrill protests, but these will emanate from the enemies, not the friends, of German democracy.

TELFORD TAYLOR

(Mr. Taylor, who now practices law in New York, attained the rank of Brigadier General during the war and served as Chief Counsel for War Crimes at Nuremberg in 1946-49.)

Intra-Arab Tensions Hamper Palestine Settlement

Since the end of the fighting over a year ago, Palestine has been divided into the state of Israel and two Arab segments. One, the Gaza strip, is still under Egyptian military occupation. The larger area, the interior of central Palestine, has been progressively merged with the realm of King 'Abdallah.

The departure, early in 1949, of Egyptian and Iraqi troops left this part of the late Palestine Mandate exclusively under the administration of 'Abdallah's forces. Upon the signing of the armistice with Israel in April 1949, 'Abdallah changed the name of his kingdom from Transjordan to Jordan. This was followed in May by the inclusion of Palestine Arabs in the Jordan cabinet, in December by the termination of the military occupation, and in April 1950 by the participation of Palestine Arabs in Jordan's national election. On April 24 the newly elected Parliament voted formal annexation of Arab Palestine. Three days later this move received the backing of Britain, the most influential great power in the area, which at the same time granted *de jure* recognition to Israel. These were only the latest developments in more than a year of fluctuating

hopes for early peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

Progress on Human Level

The armistice agreements, it is true, have been operating smoothly under Israeli-Arab mixed armistice commissions with neutral UN chairmen. The Chief of Staff of this UN Truce Supervision Organization, Brigadier General William E. Riley, U.S.M.C., reported to Secretary-General Trygve Lie in February that the "commissions—the only forum on which Arabs and Israelis are presently cooperating in direct contact under United Nations auspices—have been able to settle . . . innumerable human problems . . . on a local level and generally to contribute to the growing . . . understanding between people who but a year ago were involved in a bitter . . . conflict."

No other UN organ dealing with the problem could make so confident a report. The Trusteeship Council was getting nowhere with the General Assembly's instructions of December 1949 for the immediate internationalization of Jerusalem. By the time the Council's sixth session in Geneva adjourned on April 4, a statute

for a UN regime in Jerusalem had indeed been drafted. The all-important question of implementation, however, was deferred until the Council's June meeting in New York. Since Israel and Jordan, the two powers occupying the divided city, oppose the scheme and none of the Big Three now supports it, the Council will probably return the problem to the General Assembly in September.

In the broader field of final settlement the UN Conciliation Commission has been equally unsuccessful. In its fifteen months of existence it has been unable to persuade the Arabs to sit at the same table with Israelis, or to find a basis for even limited agreement. Its one accomplishment was the creation of the Economic Survey Mission under TVA's Gordon R. Clapp, which resulted in the General Assembly's establishment in December 1949 of a UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees. Yet a director was not found until March, when Major General Howard Kennedy of Canada was appointed to the post, and months more are likely to pass before the pilot projects can begin to meet their purpose.

By the end of February, however, it

was reported that Israel and Jordan, without formal help from the UN, had secretly negotiated and initialed a five-year nonaggression pact. It seemed likely that Israel would ratify the document. The only opposition indicated in advance was that of the extreme parties on the Right and Left. Before the Kneset (Parliament) had officially considered the matter, however, the disclosure in Israel of the negotiations precipitated a cabinet crisis in Jordan. There Premier Tawfiq Pasha abu-al-Huda resigned on March 2. When Samir Pasha al-Rifa'i proved unable to form a new cabinet, Tawfiq Pasha resumed his post, presumably on condition that the pact with Israel be shelved.

Intra-Arab Disputes

At this point active opposition to Jordan's talks with Israel, following the spirited lead of the Egyptian press, spread throughout the Arab East, and the issue became entangled with intraregional politics. The anxiety of the surrounding Arab states over 'Abdallah's desire to annex Arab Palestine was heightened by the proposed participation of that region in the Jordan elections on April 11. The fear also prevailed that the opening of commercial relations with one Arab country would enable Israel eventually to dominate regional markets.

The dispute came to a head at the semi-annual session of the Arab League Council, opening in Cairo on March 25. As an obvious challenge to Jordan, the Council seated a delegation from the "Government of All-Palestine," a group controlled by 'Abdallah's traditional opponent, the former Mufti of Jerusalem, now living in Cairo. Yet no action was taken, as had been rumored, to expel Jordan from the League, nor did 'Abdallah carry out his threat of boycotting the Council session. In fact, his sole representative, the Jordan Minister to Egypt, joined in the unanimous passage of a resolution barring League members from negotiating "separate peace treaties or any political, military or economic agreement with Israel." Decisions were also taken to tighten the economic blockade of that country. And the collective security pact, proposed at the last session of the League Council, was finally adopted on April 13.

The long-range significance of this setback to Arab-Israeli peace talks will depend on whether or not the League has really begun to restore the unity and vitality it lost in the Palestine war. The League did not tackle such pressing intra-Arab problems as the breakdown of the Lebanese-Syrian customs union or the persistent ill-feeling between Egypt and Iraq. Furthermore, Jordan's concurrence in the decisions of the League Council was allegedly prompted in part by British pressure, possibly to distract the Arab states while 'Abdallah proceeded to absorb Arab Palestine. Perhaps 'Abdallah, encouraged by this success in defying the other Arab states, may now break the stalemate by reopening the negotiations with Israel. But only time will tell whether final peace in Palestine is actually in the offing.

MIRIAM FREUND

(Miriam Freund has done research for *Fortune* magazine and during the war was on the staff of the Office of Strategic Services.)

Branch and Affiliate Meetings

- *MILWAUKEE, May 5-6, *Regional Conference on U.S. Foreign Policy*, in cooperation with the Department of State, George Kennan, David H. Popper, Leo Pasvolosky
- *ST. LOUIS, May 5, *Can the Armaments Race Be Stopped?* Frank C. Nash
- *NEW YORK, May 8, *Pakistan and the Western World*, The Prime Minister of Pakistan, Walter Lippmann, Brooks Enemy, Hon. George F. Kennan.
- OKLAHOMA CITY, May 8, *America's Stake in the Near East*, Hon. George C. McGhee
- *MILWAUKEE, May 9, *U.S. Foreign Policy in Western Europe*, Henry S. Reuss
- *SYRACUSE, May 9, *What Are the Prospects of Democracy in Germany?* E. E. Schattschneider
- *NEW YORK, May 10, *How Can We Implement Our Economic Policy?* Off-the-Record Discussion
- *CLEVELAND, May 12, *U.S. Business and Diplomacy with Latin America*, David Rockefeller
- *ALBANY, May 15, *Critical Areas in Foreign Policy*, Harold W. Bibber, James Morley, Felix E. Hirsch
- NEW ORLEANS, May 16, *The Present Situation in Germany*, Ralph Nicholson
- ST. LOUIS, May 17, *Annual Pan American Banquet*, Ambassador Mauricio Nabuco
- MILWAUKEE, May 16, *Human Rights*, Bruno T. Bitker

*Data taken from printed announcement.

An Essay for Our Times, by H. Stuart Hughes. New York, Knopf, 1950. \$2.75.

In this slim but thoughtful volume a young historian now teaching at Harvard University probes the diverse and often conflicting ideologies of West and East and calls for "a broad appreciation of the ultimate humanistic goals that unite and transcend" them.

News in the Making

AUSTRALIAN BAN ON COMMUNISM: Prime Minister Robert Gordon Menzies on April 27 introduced legislation into the Australian House of Representatives to outlaw the Communist party and Communist-dominated organizations. The measure, which would put the burden of proof on the accused, was promised by the Liberal party before its election last December following a Communist-led seven-week coal strike in July and August. Communist leaders have already been jailed on contempt and sedition charges. Meanwhile, reports from Capetown indicated South Africa would consider similar legislation, and both Panama and Bolivia have outlawed their local Communist parties.

EUROPEAN SAVINGS WANE: Recent statistics on national income in Western Europe show that gross personal savings have fallen to about 4 per cent of gross personal income. This decline—the pre-war figure was about 12 per cent—indicates that government investment and corporate self-financing have superseded individual savings as an active factor in economic development.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION IN BRAZIL: After a year of negotiations to find a presidential candidate acceptable to both President Dutra's Social Democratic party and the minority National Democratic Union, the inter-party accord—Brazil's version of bipartisanship—broke down on April 19 when the executive board of the Union announced it would propose party leader Brigadier Eduardo Gomes in the election scheduled for October 3. Brazilians are now wondering whether Dutra will make a deal with former President Vargas.

NEW ELECTIONS FOR BELGIUM: With the dissolution of the Belgian parliament to be followed by general elections on June 4, the "royal question" enters a new phase. Despite preliminary agreement on a compromise establishing Prince Bau-douin as temporary regent, conciliation broke down over King Leopold III's unwillingness to assure the Socialists that he would not seek to influence his 19-year-old son and the inability of the Liberals and the Catholic party to agree on terms for a new coalition.